

© uOttawa Students for Free Speech, 2018.

While we have taken every precaution to ensure that the content of this document is current and accurate, errors can occur. uOttawa Students for Free Speech is not responsible for any errors or omissions, or for the results obtained from the use of this information. All information in this document is provided “as is”, with no guarantee of completeness, accuracy, timeliness or of the results obtained from the use of this information.

Readers are encouraged to independently research and verify information before coming to conclusions.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	(pg. 2)
Summary of University Policies.....	(pg. 3)
Summary of Student Union Policies.....	(pg. 9)
External Groups.....	(pg. 13)
• Canadian Federation of Students (CFS).....	(pg. 13)
• Public Interest Research Groups (PIRGs).....	(pg. 15)
Appendix A: University Profiles.....	(pg. 18)
Brock University (pg. 18)	
Carleton University (pg. 21)	
Lakehead University (pg. 24)	
McMaster University (pg. 25)	
Queen's University (pg. 27)	
Ryerson University (pg. 30)	
University of Guelph (pg. 32)	
University of Ottawa (pg. 35)	
University of Toronto (pg. 37)	
University of Waterloo (pg. 40)	
University of Windsor (pg. 42)	
University of Western Ontario (pg. 44)	
Wilfrid Laurier University (pg. 46)	
York University (pg. 49)	

Executive Summary

The purpose of this document is to catalogue free speech policies throughout Ontario's universities and to identify the affiliated groups which influence them. The speech policies of 14 public universities and their respective student unions are outlined, and have been ranked in order from most to least sufficient. Additionally, two external organizations which have great influence on the university's political atmosphere have been identified and their roles explained.

In the course of preparing this document, it was discovered that most universities have poor speech policies and many have experienced adverse free speech incidents in recent years. These incidents range from student unions banning clubs to university offices reprimanding their staff for presenting unpopular opinions to their students and the general public. Over 15 of these incidents have been recorded and described in Appendix A.

It was also discovered that two large external organizations have been influencing university policy and political atmosphere in a negative way for more than 20 years: The Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) and Ontario Public Interest Research Groups (OPIRGs). Through using the students' own money to influence elections and fund radical activist groups, the CFS and OPIRGs contribute heavily to the environment of censorship found on Ontario's university campuses.

Summary of University Policies

This section summarizes the free speech policies for each of the 14 universities studied. This section is only meant to offer a brief exposition for each university. It concludes with a ranking of all universities.

Refer to Appendix A for a more comprehensive understanding of each university, the text of the policies in question and a list of adverse free speech incidents.

Brock University

Brock University could improve their policies protecting freedom of speech. Their *Statement on Respectful Dialogue and Freedom of Expression* appears to be backwards on face value. Rather than protecting the rights of students and faculty to engage freely with material, Brock's policy grants this right but requires it be done in a "culture of mutual respect." This creates vagueness in their policy because mutual respect is never defined. Therefore, free speech is only extended as far as Brock University's administration will allow it.

Carleton University

Carleton University's policies towards free speech explicitly protect free speech, including speech which is controversial and offensive. They do have a caveat though - being that the speech in question must be done in a legitimate academic pursuit. Carleton's *Sexual Violence Policy* does address the fact that the policy may come into conflict with academic freedom. Carleton University should also be commended in the way in which they dealt with a student who vandalized a free speech wall constructed by a campus club in 2013. However, their 2016 decision to ban students running for Board of Governor seats from campaigning on any substantive issues (presumably rising tuition fees) raises red flags. Aside from this minor blemish, Carleton University has adequate policies addressing free speech.

Lakehead University

Compared to other universities in Ontario, Lakehead University has good policies regarding free expression on campus. The only issue by the administration is that their rules are too open to interpretation. The *Code of Student Behaviour and Disciplinary Procedures* requires that students comply with the orders of any university personnel. A Lakehead employee could easily use their power to crack down on free speech if the

university were to give them the institutional backing to do so. Additionally, the *Harassment and Discrimination Policy and Procedures* defines harassment as any activity that “ought reasonably to be known” to cause harm. The actions of other universities have shown that the overall reasonableness of an action is not an effective barometer to determine its level of harassment. Lakehead University can improve their free speech policies by creating rules less open to interpretation and actively committing themselves to defending free speech.

McMaster University

While McMaster University has policies aimed at protecting free speech, they are noticeably lacking in two areas. First is that their *Statement on Academic Freedom* does not protect students. While the faculty should be protected in their academic pursuit, students should also be afforded the same protections. This could have easily prevented the March 2017 incident from occurring. Second is that McMaster’s actions have shown that they do not take the issue of free speech overly seriously. Their callous response to the March 2017 is suggestive of this.

Both their *Policy on Discrimination and Harassment: Prevention & Response* and the *Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities* all suffer from being too vague. These policies protect one to the extent they are found to be engaging in the pursuit of academic freedom. On its face, the issue arises over what is considered to be an academic pursuit. Additionally, who is the arbiter of this and how will they make this judgement? McMaster needs to address these issues in order to improve their policies protecting free speech. Both McMaster’s policies and practices demonstrate the free speech is not an important issue to the administration.

Queen’s University

For the most part, Queen’s University has adopted good free speech policies. Their *Student Code of Conduct* makes it clear that students have to free expression while at the university, and to exercise their right freely without fear of intimidation from others. Their *Statement on the Freedom to Read* protects the right of students to engage with any material, which is the ultimate purpose of the university. A free speech policy that Queen’s can improve is their *Room Booking Policy*. This policy would allow an overzealous administrator to crack down on free speech. That said, Queen’s University did not cancel the 2018 Grant Hall lecture featuring Dr. Jordan Peterson and Prof. Bruce Pardy, despite the fact that the *Room Booking Policy* would have allowed it. So the policy does not appear to be causing any problems.

Ryerson University

At face value, it appears that Ryerson University has good policies to address free speech. But when analysing them more deeply and contrasting their different policies, this could not be farther from reality. *Policy 61* shows this very well. While section B.1 says that nothing should be used to censor free speech, C.3 creates an exception the administration reasonably believes harm could be done. The problem here is that other universities have used this type of standard to ban speech. In order to improve their speech policies, Ryerson should establish an objective standard rather than using feelings as the standard.

University of Guelph

The University of Guelph is a very curious case regarding free speech. To sum up succinctly, the University of Guelph provides faculty the right to free speech (to an extent), but do not offer such rights to students. The only free speech right afforded to students is a right to an environment free of interruption. However with how limited free speech is to students, the scope of this right is unclear. Additionally, the University of Guelph imposes a responsibility on students to respect the diversity of students. There are two problems with this. First it reinforces the stereotype that free speech advocates tout a secret racist agenda. Second it is too imprecise to offer any meaningful insight and so vague that it can reasonably be used to shut down legitimate speech. To Guelph's credit, the protections they offer to their faculty ought to be an example to other universities.

University of Ottawa

The University of Ottawa's commitment to free speech could not be more clear - there is not one. They have no policies designed to protect free speech. Their actions confirm this apparent lack of commitment. Despite Janice Fiamengo's talk being heckled, obstructed and ultimately cancelled, Allan Rock, the University of Ottawa President, went on record as having expressed satisfaction with how the event played out. This wanton disregard for free speech is not worthy of praise.

University of Toronto

Although University of Toronto's policies detail a clear commitment to free speech which has been rigorously upheld in the past, there have been major issues over the past two years. In the case of Dr. Jordan Peterson, the university believed that his refusal to use student's "preferred pronouns" would leave him in violation of Bill C-16 and constitute a case of discrimination. This sets a dangerous precedent as professors who do not "use the right words" find themselves at risk of being brought before the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal (OHRT). In the case of the "mandatory

anti-discrimination and anti-bias training”, there is the primary concern that the content of this training is unknown and, given the University’s response to Peterson’s statement, that professors may be instructed to self-censor again at risk of being brought before the OHRT, or receiving disciplinary action from the University.

University of Waterloo

The University of Waterloo is one of the few universities where both administration and student union have outstanding policies aimed at protecting free speech. Although the administration’s free speech policies have some issues, one could easily argue that Waterloo is the proverbial ‘gold standard’ for other universities to follow. The definition of harassment in *Policy 33* on Ethical Behaviour could be improved by removing its subjective component. Additionally, *Policy 2* on bulletin boards and signage by having more concrete rules rather than removing a sign because it is “objectionable.” Aside from these two blemishes, the University of Waterloo’s free speech policies are impeccable.

University of Windsor

While the University of Windsor’s policies regarding free speech are not the best in Ontario, they are not the worst either. While the *Policy on Student Conduct* protects the free expression of ideas, their *Human Rights Policy* and *Sign Posting Policy* can be used to restrict free speech. Additionally, the imposition of the *Language Equity Guide* is tantamount to language policing - which no university that takes its commitment to free speech seriously can engage in.

The university’s actions on free speech offers suggestive evidence that whatever pro-free speech policies the university has are for appearances only. The University of Windsor neither condemned nor punished students from “Palestinian Solidarity Group” who engaged in actions violating the *Policy on Student Code of Conduct*. Additionally, they acted in bad faith when dealing with Ms. McAuley and the student group “Life Choice.” These suggest that either the University of Windsor shows preferential treatment in their application of free speech rules or free speech is not something they care to defend.

University of Western Ontario

The University of Western Ontario’s free speech policies can serve as the proverbial gold standard of free speech policies for other Ontario universities. Their policies are explicitly worded and leave little room for interpretation. It comes as no surprise then that University of Western Ontario has had no adverse free speech issues as of 2013.

Wilfrid Laurier University

While Wilfrid Laurier University's *Values, Vision, Mission* policy would suggest that they have a strong commitment to free speech, a deeper analysis shows this not to be the case. The policy only says that "excellence in learning, research, scholarship and creativity" are all priorities to the university. However, this cannot be done in an environment which does not protect free speech.

To this end, Wilfrid Laurier University's free speech policies are among the worst in the province. Their *Bulletin Boards and Temporary Signs and Notices* policy allows the University President to unilaterally decide what signage material is acceptable. Their *Statement on Freedom of Expression* promotes "inclusive freedom" rather than a form of absolute freedom. Probably the most draconian of their policies is the *Gendered and Sexual Violence Policy and Procedures*, which gives the university carte blanche in the name of protecting students from sexual violence. Wilfrid Laurier University has a history of using this to crack down on legitimate forms of academic freedom. For example, this was the policy used to reprimand Lindsay Shepherd for leading a discussion of gender neutral pronouns. The way in which the university used this policy to conduct a witch hunt of Shepherd speaks volumes about their commitment to free speech.

York University

While York University generally has good policies regarding free speech, their heavy-handed rules regarding security fees inhibit free speech. History has shown that schools will impose outrageous security fees in order to prevent speech they do not like. The fact the York has sole discretion to set the fees as they see fit is problematic, especially when they can decide to cancel the event after the fees are paid. York University can improve their free speech policies by removing their rules governing security fees, which is used as the free speech equivalent of the poll tax.

University Ranking

With this in mind, the authors have decided to rank the free speech policies of universities as follows:

1. University of Waterloo
2. University of Western Ontario
3. Queen's University
4. York University
5. University of Guelph
6. University of Toronto

7. Lakehead University
8. Carleton University
9. Brock University
10. Ryerson University
11. McMaster University
12. University of Windsor
13. University of Ottawa
14. Wilfrid Laurier University

Summary of Student Union Policies

This section summarizes the free speech policies for 12 student unions at each university studied. The Lakehead University Student Union (LUSU) and the University of Windsor Students' Alliance (UWSA) are omitted because they have neither positive nor negative policies pertaining to free speech. This section is only meant to offer a brief exposition for each union. It concludes with a ranking of all unions.

Refer to Appendix A for a more comprehensive understanding of each student, the text of the policies in question and a list of adverse free speech incidents.

Alma Mater Society (AMS) - Queen's University

The Alma Mater Society (AMS) should be lauded for having some pro-free speech policies. Their constitution acknowledges that the university experience should expose students to a range of different ideas and perspectives. This requires protecting free speech. Another way AMS protects free speech is through the adoption of *Political Neutrality*, whereby the union refuses to take an official stance on political issues that do not affect the student body. This is an important policy to adopt because many student unions will take stances on political issues and then require all of its clubs (for example) to adopt these same stances. If the clubs do not adopt these stances, they are denied official status and banned from campus. A *Political Neutrality* policy would prevent student unions from cracking down on speech, but doing so on the grounds of not conforming to official policy.

Brock University Students' Union (BUSU) - Brock University

The Brock University Students' Union (BUSU) has equally lacklustre free speech policies of their own compared to the university. Aside from prohibiting the disruption of events and use of threatening behaviour, the *BUSU Code of Conduct* does nothing to acknowledge a student's right to free speech. It appeals to the overall vagueness of the *Ontario Human Rights Code* for its justification on limited free speech rights. Their clubs bylaw falls into the same trap by requiring all clubs to follow provincial laws. Given that the scope of the OHRC is unclear, this policy gives BUSU much latitude to censor clubs they do not agree with. To their credit, they have not done this and are one of the few unions to publicly defend their campus' pro-life club, Brock Life-line.

Carleton University Students' Association (CUSA) - Carleton University

The Carleton University Students' Association (CUSA) is met with mixed reaction. Their policies (namely the *Support Freedom of Expression Policy* and *Discrimination on Campus Policy*) would suggest that the CUSA supports free speech. However, there are two problems with this assessment. First is their bylaw on clubs. The CUSA is of the position that only groups which serve a legitimate purpose to the university community may become official clubs. The bylaws offer no criteria for how this determination is to be made. Second is that the CUSA has a track record of bending the rules to remove clubs they do not like; most notably being the pro life club. CUSA held that a pro life club would violate their *Discrimination on Campus Policy* on the grounds that they would engage in hate speech, despite no history of this. The CUSA's free speech policies are not worth the paper they are written on if this is how they are going to conduct themselves in dealing with clubs.

Federation of Students (FEDS) - University of Waterloo

The Federation of Students (FEDS), the student union, is one of the few unions in Ontario to protect free speech for their members. Their clubs policy acknowledges that student groups will have diverging opinions and encourages this diversity. It is also refreshing to see that student union once supported the *Chicago Principles* and lobbied the university to adopt them. The *Chicago Principles* are regarded as the ultimate authority on free speech on campuses and FEDS should be lauded for having once supported these. The continued advocacy of these principles, while not necessary, is certainly welcome.

McMaster Student Union (MSU) - McMaster University

The McMaster Student Union (MSU) is noticeably lacking in its policies addressing free speech. The only protection they offer is to not censor existing clubs for political reasons. They do not afford this same protection to prospective clubs.

Ryerson Student Union (RSU) - Ryerson University

The Ryerson Student Union (RSU) does not fair much better. While they are right to criticize Ryerson University for adopting such a free speech code, their solution is arguably as bad. It is certainly noble to ban speech that is rooted in "anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, and ableism." But the obvious problem is that these have just become buzzwords used to silence undesirable speech. The frivolous use of these terms makes it such that this is a bad standard to judge speech by.

Student Federation of the University of Ottawa (SFUO) - University of Ottawa

The Student Federation of the University of Ottawa (SFUO) is regarded as one of the worst student unions in Canada. Their views on free speech do nothing to fight this perception, as they have actively used their resources to target groups for their political opinions (particularly the pro-life, Jewish cultural and free speech clubs).

University of Guelph Central Student Association's (CSA) - Guelph University

The University of Guelph Central Student Association's (CSA) policies and procedures pertaining to free speech are of similar vein. *Bylaw 1* is very similar to policies that other schools have used to ban very legitimate speech. *CSA Board Policy 26* is similar in this regard. To the CSA's credit, their belief that the University of Guelph should apply non-political standards in faculty hiring should be praised. But it should also be noted such a policy carries no weight, as it is the university that makes hiring decisions and not the student union.

University of Toronto Students' Union (UTSU) - University of Toronto

The University of Toronto Students' Union (UTSU) has no policies aimed at free speech, except for their *Union Clubs* policy. The policy bans clubs who are perceived to have violated UTSU's understanding of the OHRC. This policy can easily be used to crack down on free speech policies.

University Student Council (USC) - University of Western Ontario

The University Student Council is a slightly different story. The only free speech policy worth reporting is their ban on objectionable material. This standard is too loose and could easily ban anything conceivable. That said, it is surprising with such loose rules that there have been no major free speech incidents to report. In fact, the only incident worthy of reporting is a positive one.

Wilfrid Laurier University Students' Union (WLUSU) - Wilfrid Laurier University

The Wilfrid Laurier University Students' Union (WLUSU) does not acknowledge the free speech rights of their members. Their *Clubs and Associations Department Policy* allows WLUSU to ban clubs based on whether or not the club (or its parent organization) engages in "coercive techniques." Additionally, it requires all clubs to follow Wilfrid Laurier University's *Harassment & Discrimination Policy*, the *Gendered and Sexual Violence Policies & Procedures*, and the *Student Code of Conduct*. Given that the university has shown their liberal application of these rules, it is likely that the WLUSU also engages in this practice.

York Federation of Students (YFS) - York University

The York Federation of Students (YFS) has among the worst policies addressing free speech. Their VP Equity has much latitude when dealing with issues involving equity and discrimination. Their clubs policy is equally heavy handed in that they appeal to the OHRC and take advantage of its vague interpretation. Additionally, the YFS adopts many of the problematic clubs policies that other unions have used to ban clubs for political reasons.

Student Union Ranking

With this in mind, the authors have decided to rank the free speech policies of student unions as follows:

1. Alma Mater Society (AMS) - Queen's University
2. Federation of Students (FEDS) - University of Waterloo
3. Brock University Students' Union (BUSU) - Brock University
4. University Student Council (USC) - University of Western Ontario
5. University of Guelph Central Student Association's (CSA) - Guelph University
6. University of Toronto Student Union (UTSU) - University of Toronto
7. Carleton University Students' Association (CUSA) - Carleton University
8. McMaster Student Union (MSU) - McMaster University
9. Ryerson Student Union (RSU) - Ryerson University
10. York Federation of Students (YFS) - York University
11. Student Federation of the University of Ottawa (SFUO)
12. Wilfrid Laurier University Students' Union (WLUSU)

External Groups

The Canadian Federation of Students

The Canadian Federation of Students (CFS) is the largest student organization in Canada. It is comprised of local student unions, funded by dues paid by the students through these unions as part of their incidental fees. At University of Ottawa, for example, full time undergraduate students pay \$9.14 to the Federal CFS and \$7.62 to CFS Ontario per academic year. This adds up to roughly \$500,000 paid to the CFS per year from this university alone. The majority of Ontario's undergraduate student unions are members of the CFS.

The CFS, however, has notable issues. The following is an excerpt from a research document on the topic corruption within the CFS in recent years:

“Drawing largely on a large number of primary and secondary source documents, this paper argues that the CFS is governed, de facto, as an oligarchy consisting of a relatively small group of staff and directors. [...] Specifically, this paper argues:

- that the referendum processes provided in CFS bylaws violate all rational norms for the fair administration of referenda, through a biased Referendum Oversight Committee that perpetuates the ***systematic suppression of freedom of speech on campus during the months preceding an affiliation or disaffiliation referendum***;
- [...]
- that the CFS is internally organized along democratic centralist lines, in which the “student movement” is conceived as a single, structured organization that is expected to adhere to centrally-determined decisions, rather than as a voluntary federation of autonomous students’ unions; that ***there is considerable evidence that senior CFS officials have interfered in local students’ union elections***;
- that on a number of occasions, senior CFS officials have orchestrated a campaign of sabotage against “competing” student organizations, including the Canadian Alliance of Student Associations, as well as a number of other organizations that have since collapsed in part due to this sabotage;
- that CFS general meetings are tightly controlled, deliberately cut off from the general membership, and manipulated by CFS and students’ union staff in order to ensure that desired results are achieved; and, that the corporate culture of the CFS is such that the

relationship between CFS officers and staff is subverted, such that officers tend to see themselves as “bureaucrats-intraining” rather than as elected student representatives.”

(from *Solidarity For Their Own Good, Self-Determination and The Canadian Federation of Students*, by Titus Gregory, pg. 3, 4. Full document is available at: <http://www.studentunion.ca/solidarity-paper.pdf>. Emphasis in bold/italics ours.)

The CFS’ frequently fails to recognize referendums held by its members to exit the organization (usually over minor issues in the referendum process), resulting in many lawsuits where either the CFS attempts to recoup “losses” or where the respective union attempts to exit through legal means. These include but are not limited to:

- Cape Breton University Students Union (2009, Defendant, Lost Case)
- Concordia Students’ Union (2011, Plaintiff, Out-of-court agreement reached)
- University of Victoria Students Society (2011, Series of Cases, BC-CFS voted to terminate UVSS membership in 2013, ending dispute)

In 2017, a forensic audit determined that the CFS operates a “hidden bank account” where approximately \$263,000 in deposits and \$262,000 in withdrawals were made between July 2010 and December 2014. On three separate occasions when asked if this money was used to influence local student elections, the CFS declined to answer, despite previously insisting it does not do so. This, combined with the information contained in *Solidarity For Their Own Good* raises important questions as to whether or not the CFS has been influencing local student elections in its favour. The CFS has since refused to release the full audit, arguing that it is under no obligation to do so. This is in spite of a Bylaw which states that:

“Each member of the Federation is entitled to have access to all information and official documents concerning the operations and activities of the Federation and of the National Executive.”

(Additional information can be found at:

<https://thevarsity.ca/2017/09/11/cfs-audit-reveals-details-of-hidden-bank-account/>)

Ontario Public Interest Research Groups (OPIRGs)

OPIRG-Brock	\$1.50 is levied per academic year from all full-time undergraduate Brock students through the BUSU. The amount collected from students was projected to be approximately \$116,000 in their 2017/18 budget.
OPIRG-Carleton	\$7.10 is levied from all full-time undergraduate students through the CUSA \$6.94 is levied from all graduate students through their graduate student union (GSA Carleton) OPIRG-Carleton received approximately \$192,000 from students during the year ending August 31st, 2016 as per their latest financial statement
OPIRG-Guelph	\$14.12 will be levied from all undergraduate students during the 2018/19 academic year through the CSA Guelph OPIRG-Guelph will receive an estimated \$300,000 during the 2018/19 academic year (\$303,374 was received in 2016/17)
OPIRG-Kingston	[AMS students voted to defund in 2013]
Laurier Students-PIRG	\$10.66 is levied from all undergraduate students attending Wilfrid Laurier through WLU Students' Union (WLUSU) LSPIRG will receive an estimated \$188,000 during the 2018/19 academic year

	“Action groups” include a group by the name of the “Campus Anti-Fascist Network (CAN)” • Chapters at Carleton, Wilfred Laurier, and York • “CAN brings together faculty, students, staff, and community members across US campuses to stem the rise of fascism, whether proudly displayed in hateful exclusionary slogans and posters, or disguised as “free speech.” WLU’s Diversity and Equity Office lists LSPIRG as an “Additional Resource” on its website
OPIRG-McMaster	\$8.07 is levied per academic year from all full-time undergraduate students at McMaster through the MSU An estimated \$216,000 in funding will be given to McMaster through the MSU in the 2018/19 year
OPIRG-GRIPO Ottawa	\$8.02 will be levied from all undergraduate students during the 2018/19 academic year through the SFUO The amount collected from students from May 2016 to Feb 2017 was approximately \$157,000 Expenses include • \$500 to the Revolutionary Student Movement (RSM) uOttawa • \$500 to RSM Algonquin (College) • \$500 to the Proletarian Feminist Front - Ottawa (Communist and Anti-fascist) \$500 was budgeted for the “Revolutionary Workers Movement” (Marxist-Leninist group), but they did not

	end up receiving any funding in the 2016/17 academic year
OPIRG-Peterborough	\$13.57 is collected per academic year from all undergraduate students attending Trent University through their student union (TSCA) The amount collected from Trent students in the 2017/18 year was approximately \$83,000
OPIRG-Toronto	The amount collected from University of Toronto students in the 2015/16 year was approximately \$137,000
OPIRG-York	\$0.15 is levied per credit. As most full-time undergraduate students take 30 credit-hours per year, usually \$4.50 per academic year is levied from undergraduate students through the YUSU An estimated \$208,000 in funding will be given to OPIRG-York through the YUSU in the 2018/19 year RSM York University is a “working group” of this PIRG, meaning they receive resources and funding through OPIRG-York (Last updated 2015/16)
Waterloo-PIRG	[FEDS students voted to defund in 2016]

Additional Notes

- An equalization agreement is in place where a percentage of funds from each PIRG are paid to OPIRG and redistributed amongst the branches
- The overwhelming majority of levies go towards staff salaries and benefits
- Some PIRGs do not provide a detailed list of expenses, and a few do not post their expenses at all online

Appendix A: University Profiles

Brock University

Campus Overview

Location: St. Catharines

Undergraduate Student Union(s): Brock University Students' Union (BUSU)

CFS Affiliation: CFS Local 102

Speech Policy

- University Policy
 - *Statement on Respectful Dialogue and Freedom of Expression*
 - ¶ 2: “A community where teaching, research and academic freedom will flourish includes an environment where freedom of expression, speech, association and belief is safeguarded and exercised in a culture of mutual respect; where an open exchange of diverse points of views is encouraged; and where every member of the community, including guests and visitors, is able to work, live, teach and learn free from harassment and discrimination.”
 - ¶ 3: “the University acknowledges its responsibility to uphold [free expression, speech, association and belief] and to develop implementation strategies that will ensure the lawful protection of these rights and principles.”
 - *Respectful Work and Learning Environment Policy*
 - 1: defines harassment as “engaging in a course of vexatious comment or conduct that is known to be or ought reasonably to be known to be unwelcome to an individual or group”, where vexatious is defined as “lacking a sufficient ground and only serving to annoy and distress.”
 - 2: Brock University supports equity, diversity and the dignity of all people...The University recognizes the following:...A duty to act in a manner consistent with existing legislation regarding human rights; A commitment to academic freedom and freedom of thought, inquiry, and expression among its members that may result in respectful disagreements regarding beliefs or principles.

- Appendix A, § Human Rights Harassment: examples of harassment include “silencing talk of sexual or gender diversity; linking homosexuality with pedophilia (child abuse); treating the sexual orientations or gender identities of LGBTQ persons as less valid than those of heterosexuals” (among others).
 - Appendix A, § Personal Harassment, Psychological Harassment and Bullying: Activities that lend themselves to the “legitimate exercise of academic freedom and expression in teaching and research” or “respectfully expressing disagreement or stating a contrary but reasonable point of view” are not considered personal or psychological harassment.
- BUSU Constitution
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy.
- BUSU By-Laws
 - *By-Law 500: Clubs Bylaw*
 - 57: “A group may be ratified by BUSU only if it:...b) Intends to carry out activities which in no way violate any federal or provincial laws, municipal bylaws, university policies and/or regulations, or BUSU bylaws and policies; and which do not infringe upon the rights and privileges of others...e) It shares similar values to the mandate of BUSU according to its constitution.”
 - 84.a: Clubs can be de-ratified if they engage in “discriminatory behaviour of any kind” or “violence and/or harassment towards any member or non-member of the club.”
- BUSU Policies
 - *BUSU Code of Conduct*
 - 1.7.1: “In common with all other individuals in Ontario, BUSU Members enjoy rights under both the Ontario Human Rights Code and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. That enjoyment is subject to such limits contained therein...The extent of a right or a freedom may reasonably vary with the circumstances so that an exercise of a right which may be appropriate in a public place may not be appropriate in an educational institution.”
 - 1.8.1: Disrupting an event occurring in a BUSU space is prohibited.
 - 1.8.3: Conduct that threatens the safety of another person is prohibited.
 - *BUSU Operating Policies and Procedures - Student Services*

- 6.8: “BUSU will not neglect or disregard any ratified Club over reasons of political, religious or value centered beliefs – BUSU’s philosophy remains a-political in club management.”
- 6.10: “No club can be arbitrarily de-ratified.”

Highlighted Incidents

1. In February 2015, “Brock Life Line”, the pro life club, invited pro-life author and lecturer Trent Horn to campus for an event titled *Does human life matter? Why the unborn life should count*. Protesters repeatedly heckled Horn during his presentation, leading him to request Campus Security. Campus Security arrived twenty minutes after being phoned, but stood by as chanting, noise-making and shouting continued, forcing Horn to skip the remainder of his presentation and go straight to Q & A.

Carleton University

Campus Overview

Location: Ottawa

Undergraduate Student Union: Carleton University Students' Association (CUSA)

CFS Affiliation: CFS Local 01

Speech Policy

- University Policy
 - *Human Rights Policies and Procedures*
 - I.4.1: “Academic freedom is the freedom to examine, question, teach and learn. It involves the right to investigate, speculate and comment without reference to prescribed doctrine, as well as the right to criticize the University and society at large. Academic freedom carries with it the duty to use that freedom in a manner consistent with ethical guidelines and human rights law, and the scholarly obligation to base research and teaching on an honest search for knowledge.”
 - I.4.2: “The frank discussion of controversial ideas, the examination of various or competing perspectives, the pursuit and publication of controversial research, and the study and teaching of material with controversial and even offensive content in the context of conscientious, professional instruction in the University are protected within academic freedom.
 - I.5.2: “Academic and administrative managers are expected to foster an environment in their area that is free of discrimination or harassment.”
 - I.6: “The University respects the rights of speech and dissent and upholds the right to peaceful assembly and expression of dissent.”
 - I.7: “The University promotes equity and diversity. Every member of the University community has a right to study, work and live in a safe environment free of discrimination or harassment, including sexual harassment.”
 - *Sexual Violence Policy*
 - 5.1: “The University will... c) contribute to a campus atmosphere in which sexual violence is not tolerated while recognizing academic freedom for students, faculty and staff to explore controversial topics related to this issue.”
 - *Student Rights and Responsibilities Policy*

- Section VI grants students various rights, including freedom of association (VI.1), the freedom to discuss controversial ideas in a manner consistent with the OHRC (VI.2) and freedom of assembly within the confines of the law (VI.3).
 - VII.A.1: “No student shall engage in disruptive conduct affecting any activity or service of the University or its members.”
 - VII.B.2: “No student shall, on University premises or off-campus, individually or with a group, or in connection with a demonstration including picketing or a rally: use words which threaten violence or physical abuse to any group or individual [or] use words...which incites others to behaviour which (would) result(s) in misconduct.”
- CUSA Constitution
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy
- CUSA By-Laws
 - *Bylaw IX: Clubs and Societies*
 - §1.2.a: “Clubs may be any other student organization joined by a common interest, and may only be established such that the aim of a Club shall be to provide a social [or] academic environment and to benefit its membership as well as the Carleton community through enhancement of the university experience.”
- CUSA Policies
 - *Declaration of Students’ Institutional and Academic Rights Policy*
 - “Every student, full or part-time, has the right to;...7) openly question and freely comment on course material without penalty.”
 - *Support Freedom of Expression Policy*
 - §1: “CUSA recognizes that within the unique university context, the most crucial of all human rights are freedom of speech, academic freedom, and freedom research...The right to engage in frank and open debate, to share controversial and unpopular ideas, and to challenge society’s core beliefs, is essential for the pursuit of truth, and for preserving a free and democratic society.”
 - §3: “CUSA affirms that the principles of academic freedom, which protect the right of professors to pursue controversial areas of research and to express and disseminate unpopular ideas, apply equally to students.”
 - §4: “CUSA accepts that the free and open exchange of ideas will generate controversy and disputes among members of the University, and in the wider community. In such cases, CUSA will support and protect the free speech rights of all persons, including

and especially those who adhere to unpopular beliefs or controversial opinions.”

- §5: “CUSA recognizes that freedom of expression is limited to peaceful means and non-coercive methods. CUSA expressly rejects the use of violence, physical force, and physical coercion as methods to express one’s views, or as methods to prevent others from expressing their views. Controversial or unpopular ideas should be addressed through debate, reason, and argument, and not by silencing one’s opponents through blocking, obstructing, disrupting or otherwise suppressing unpopular or controversial speech on campus.”
- *Discrimination on Campus Policy*
 - §3: “CUSA and CUSA Inc., prohibits its services from carrying or distributing any written material, audio material, computer software or any other electronic medium with content deemed to have such ideologies as a basis for their content as this is in direct violation of Canada's hate laws.”

Highlighted Incidents

1. In April 2016, students running for BoG positions were not allowed to campaign on any platform points: “Unlike elections in previous years, candidates were told they were not allowed to campaign on any platform points, or in any way tell students what they would do on the board if they were elected. Candidates can have posters, but those posters cannot mention student issues, such as tuition fees. Candidates can give class talks, but they cannot answer specific questions from students. Either of these things can result in disqualification.”
2. In January 2013, the Carleton branch of “Students for Liberty” constructed a free speech wall. The wall was vandalized and stolen by Arun Smith, a seventh-year human rights student. Smith claimed responsibility, saying “If everyone speaks freely we end up simply reinforcing the hierarchies that are created in our society.” Carleton’s *Office of Student Affairs* sanctioned Smith and his actions were condemned by the CUSA.
3. In January 2013, Carleton “Lifeline”, Carleton’s pro life club, was unsuccessful in their application for official club status after being rejected annually since 2010. CUSA repeatedly denied “Lifeline” status on the grounds that their existence would constitute “hate speech” and be inconsistent with their *Discrimination on Campus Policy*.

Lakehead University

Campus Overview

Location: Thunder Bay

Student Population:

- Undergraduates: 7,237
- Graduates: 1,047

Undergraduate Student Union: Lakehead University Student Union (LUSU)

CFS Affiliation: CFS Local 32

Speech Policy

- University Policy
 - *Code of Student Behaviour and Disciplinary Procedures*
 - Preamble to Code of Student Behaviour says that no part of the code can be used to prohibit “peaceful assemblies, demonstrations, or free speech.”
 - Article 1, Section 2.9: “Non-academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to: failure to comply with directions of members of the University administration or of authorized university personnel acting in the proper performance of their particular duties.”
 - *Harassment and Discrimination Policy and Procedures*
 - Section 2.2: “Personal Harassment is behaviour that generally involves a course of comment or conduct directed towards a person or persons...which is known or ought reasonably to be known, to have the effect of creating an intimidating, humiliating, or hostile educational or work environment.”
- LUSU Constitution
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy
- LUSU By-Laws
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy
- LUSU Policies
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy

Highlighted Incidents

1. In 2008, the Lakehead University Student Union voted to declare itself a pro-choice organization and remove all rights and privileges of “Lakehead University Life Support,” the university’s pro life club. Matt Granville, VP Finance of LUSU, is told the Chronicle Journal, “If [Life Support] showed up with enough students that were interested they could reinstate themselves as a club.”

McMaster University

Campus Overview

Location: Hamilton

Undergraduate Student Union: McMaster Student Union (MSU)

CFS Affiliation: None

Speech Policy

- University Policy
 - *Statement on Academic Freedom*
 - ¶ 1: Provides university staff with academic freedom, allowing them to “pursue multiple avenues of inquiry; to teach and to learn unhindered by non-academic constraints; and to engage in full and unrestricted consideration of any opinion.” Also condemns any behaviour that interferes with this principle.
 - ¶ 2: McMaster University will protect faculty against efforts to censor speech.
 - ¶ 3: Academic freedom is only protected to the extent that one is engaging in “the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge.”
 - *Policy on Discrimination and Harassment: Prevention & Response*
 - Section 1.16: “This Policy expressly prohibits any discriminatory or harassing action and/or conduct...in a manner that *exceeds the bounds* of freedom of expression and academic freedom.”
 - NB: other policies at McMaster University have similar provisions. For brevity’s sake, they will not be discussed in depth.
 - *Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities*
 - Section 3.32: “Violations of this Code include, but are not limited to: c) engaging in verbal or non-verbal behaviour or communication toward any individual or group *that may be perceived to be* intimidating, degrading, harassing and/or discriminatory, and in a manner that *exceeds the bounds* of freedom of expression.”
- MSU Operating Policies
 - *MSU Clubs Policy*
 - Section 2.2: “Under the terms of this policy, the MSU will not attempt to censor, control or interfere with any existing MSU Club on the basis of its philosophy, beliefs, interests or opinions

expressed unless and until these lead to activities which are illegal or which infringe upon the rights and freedoms of others.”

Highlighted Incidents

1. In March 2017, a student organized debate took place at McMaster University regarding freedom of speech and political correctness on university campuses. The debate was initially set to include three McMaster professors, Dr. Liyakat Takim, Dr. Matthew Grellete, and Dr. Philippa Carter. Organizers made a late decision to add Dr. Jordan Peterson of the University of Toronto to the program. In protest, the three McMaster professors withdrew their participation - with Dr. Philippa Carter citing security concerns.

At the start of the event, Dr. Peterson was subjected to harassment from a group of 20 protestors, including one who blew an airhorn near Dr. Peterson's head. Five security officers from McMaster University stood down as this continued, despite reassuring organizers that they would tolerate this sort of behaviour. This continued for about one hour until Dr. Peterson left and held his discussion outside. McMaster University failed to condemn the actions of the protestors and lauded the work of their security personnel. Gord Arbeau, a spokesperson for the university, defended the university's actions, telling the CBC “had there been concerns about personal safety, we are confident that our security officers would have taken appropriate action.” Additionally, Patrick Deane, President of McMaster University, issued a statement defending the event.

Queen's University

Campus Overview

Location: Kingston

Undergraduate Student Union: Alma Mater Society (AMS)

CFS Affiliation: None

Speech Policy

- University Policy
 - *Queen's University Student Code of Conduct*
 - IV.9: "Nothing in this Code prohibits Student participation in lawful and peaceful public assemblies and demonstrations, nor inhibits Students' lawful and non-violent freedom of expression. This does not, however, relieve a Student who is also an employee of the University of employment-related obligations."
 - VI.E.a: Prohibits the "disruption or obstruction by action, threat or otherwise, of any University event or any Sanctioned Activity, including teaching, learning, research, administration, events, and, any conduct that disrupts the normal operations of the University or that infringes on the rights of another member of the University community."
 - *Statement on the Freedom to Read at Queen's University*
 - ¶ 1: "Universities are interested in universal knowledge, including all religious, philosophical and political viewpoints, in all languages and cultures."
 - ¶ 2: "Accordingly, Queen's University endorses the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, which includes, along with the right to express thoughts publicly, the fundamental right of access of every person to all expressions of knowledge. The intellectual freedom fostered and protected by the enshrinement of these rights is basic to the proper functioning of the University and to the healthy development of Canadian society of which it is a part."
 - *Room Booking Policy*
 - ¶ 1: "The event will not bring discredit upon the university."

- ¶ 2: “The event will not infringe on human rights legislation or be obscene or beyond the bounds of common decency under applicable laws in Ontario.”
- AMS Constitution
 - 2.01.3.IV: “The AMS shall strive to provide a stimulating and accessible educational experience at Queen’s that promotes diversity of intellectual representation and perspective.”
 - 6.06.01: “The Social Issues Commission acts in full compliance with the AMS Mission Statement to fulfil the following areas of jurisdiction: (i) *representing the diversity of students at Queen’s through anti-oppression activism*; (ii) advocating for social change by lobbying the administration and raising awareness in the University community.”
- AMS Bylaws
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy
- AMS Policy Manual
 - *AMS Policy Manual 3: Representational Policy*
 - § 2 Commitment to Political Neutrality: “The AMS shall not take positions on governmental policy or political issues that do not directly relate to Queen's University and its students, and commits itself to a general policy of political neutrality regarding such issues ... The AMS welcomes diversity of opinion and feels that a position of political neutrality can better foster openness and inclusivity than a politicized AMS.”
 - *AMS Policy Manual 4: Non-Academic Discipline Rules and Regulations*
 - § A.4: Judicial Committee: “the AMS Judicial Committee may exercise jurisdiction regarding;...iv) infringement of the rights of any member of the University community or general public, including but not limited to excessive noise and general public disturbance.”
 - [Editor’s Note: the Judicial Committee is responsible for hearing and adjudicating on matters of non-academic discipline by the AMS.]

Highlighted Incidents

1. In March 2018, Dr. Jordan Peterson and Queen’s professor Bruce Pardy gave a lecture at Grant Hall. The lecture was heavily protested by some of the student population and professors, but still took place due to the insistence of Queen’s Principal Daniel Woolf among others. As it took place, around 150 protestors

outside the hall held signs, chanted, and used other noise-making tactics such as hitting garbage cans, hitting doors, and hitting the mosaic glass windows, one of which was broken. At the beginning, infiltrated protestors attempted to shout down the two speakers, bringing up a sign on stage at one point before being escorted out by security. Security were posted around Grant Hall and the rest of the lecture went relatively smoothly despite the noise-making.

2. In April 2013, a club called “Students for Liberty” constructed a free speech wall in the John Deutsch University Centre. The wall was scheduled to be up for four days and students were invited to write on it. At the end of the first day, Arig Girgrah, Assistant Dean for Student Affairs, ordered the wall be taken down and confiscated because it featured “offensive content.” Girgrah did not elaborate as to which written statements were offensive. This sentiment was echoed by Doug Johnson, President of the AMS, and threatened to remove the booking rights of “Students for Liberty” if they did not remove the wall.

Ryerson University

Campus Overview

Location: Toronto

Undergraduate Student Union: Ryerson Student Union (RSU)

CFS Affiliation: CFS Local 24

Speech Policy

- University Policy
 - *Statement on Freedom of Speech*
 - ¶ 2: encourages free speech in the university community.
 - ¶ 6: limits the extent of free speech to that which is “recognized in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms” and gives the administration the authority to intervene when speech “is used in a way that is itself unlawful or prevents the lawful exercise of free speech by others.”
 - *Policy 61: Student Code of Non-Academic Conduct*
 - B.1: “Nothing in this Code shall be construed to prohibit peaceful assemblies and demonstrations, lawful picketing, or to inhibit freedom of expression.”
 - C.3: “Students shall not endanger, threaten, harm, or encourage others to endanger, threaten or harm, or act in ways which would reasonably be *perceived to* endanger, threaten or harm the physical and mental well-being of community members.”
 - *Discrimination and Harassment Prevention Policy*
 - § Guiding Principle #4: “Freedom of expression is the cornerstone of education at Ryerson University, but like other Charter rights, it is not an absolute right...The rights and freedoms guaranteed in the Charter are "subject only to reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society." Human rights, for example, may place limits on these freedoms.”
- RSU Constitution
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy
- RSU By-Laws

- This document does not contain any relevant policy
- RSU Policies
 - Section 4 on *Non-Academic Codes Of Conduct*
 - 4.1: condemns the adoption of non-academic speech codes.
 - 4.2: “The [RSU] believes that students have fundamental rights to freedom of assembly, dissent, and expression.”
 - 4.4.i: “Any speech or expression that is hate speech rooted in...anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, and ableism.”

Highlighted Incidents

1. On August 22, 2017, a panel entitled “The Stifling of Free Speech on University Campuses” was set to take place at Ryerson. The panelists were Rebel Media journalist Faith Goldy, Dr. Jordan Peterson from the University of Toronto and Dr. Gad Saad from Concordia University. Ryerson cancelled the room booking under the auspices that similar events that occurred in Charlottesville, Virginia would occur at the event. Without a venue, the event was cancelled.

2. On January 31, 2014, the Canadian Association for Equality (CAFE) hosted an event called “Are Men Obsolete? Feminism, Free Speech and the Censorship of Men’s Issues.” The keynote speaker was author Karen Straughn. In addition to relocating the event to a less central venue, Ryerson informed CAFE that they would have to pay an additional \$1,600 in security fees. Sheldon Levy, President of Ryerson University, admitted the fee was designed to obstruct the event, telling the student newspaper, “We share the university’s goal to promote freedom of expression, but recognize that freedom of speech comes with the responsibility to ensure that student safety is prioritized.”

University of Guelph

Campus Overview

Location: Guelph

Undergraduate Student Union: University of Guelph Central Student Association (CSA)

CFS Affiliation: CFS Local 54

Speech Policy

- University Policy
 - *Student Rights and Responsibilities*
 - 2.3: “You have the RIGHT to an environment where the inherent worth of all individuals is respected, regardless of race, sex, national or ethnic origin, religion, age, sexual orientation or mental or physical disability. You have the RESPONSIBILITY to respect the diversity that exists in the University community. The University views actions that undermine the dignity and worth of any individual or group based on the above grounds to be particularly grievous.” (emphasis not added)
 - 2.20: “You have the RIGHT to an environment that, while safeguarding dissent, is free from interference and disruption. You have the RESPONSIBILITY not to interfere with the normal functioning of the University, nor to intimidate, interfere with, threaten or otherwise obstruct any activity organized by the University, including classes, or to hinder other members of the University community from being able to carry on their legitimate activities, including their ability to speak or associate with others.” (emphasis not added)
 - *Collective Agreement Between The University of Guelph and the University of Guelph Faculty Association:*
 - 7.3: “Academic Freedom is the right to examine, pursue, develop, and transmit knowledge and ideas through research, teaching, study, discussion, documentation, production, creation or writing. Academic Freedom specifically provides protection of: e) freedom from institutional censorship; all without deference to prescribed doctrine.”

- 7.7: “The exercise of Academic Freedom as per this Article shall not be grounds for disciplinary proceedings.”
- *University of Guelph Diversity and Human Rights Policy:*
 - “The University acknowledges that situations arise in which there is a perceived conflict between academic freedom and human rights. A violation of either freedom is of grave concern to the University. With respect to the interplay of human rights protection and the practice of academic freedom, it is the position of the University that discussion of controversial issues in or out of the classroom is not a violation of this Policy.

Academic freedom entails the right of all University community members to make statements that challenge and may even offend the sensibilities, ideas and beliefs of others. On the other hand, academic freedom does not entail a right to discriminate against or harass individuals on grounds protected by the Code and this Policy.”

- Discrimination later defined as “A distinction, *whether intentional or not*, but based on grounds relating to personal characteristics of the individual or group, which has the effect of imposing burdens, obligations or disadvantages on such individuals or groups not imposed upon others, or which withholds or limits access to opportunities, benefits, and advantages available to other members of society.”
- CSA By-Laws
 - Bylaw 1 – Organizational
 - 1.2.1: “The CSA is committed to serve and protect the rights of undergraduate students at the University of Guelph. The aims of the CSA is three-fold: b) Enhance the Student Experience –We work to build a community on-and off-campus free from all forms of oppression.”
- CSA Board Policies
 - *CSA Human Resources Policy 26, “Respect in the Workplace”*
 - 26.1: “The C.S.A. is committed to maintaining an open and fair working anti-oppressive environment for each individual involved in the CSA consistent with the exercise of free speech and with enjoyment of social relationships which are a normal part of life. Central to this commitment is the belief that it is the right of each C.S.A. staff member or volunteer to work in an environment free

from harassment and discrimination and where each individual is treated with respect.”

- *CSA Issues and Organizational Policy 1*, “Policy on the University of Guelph”
 - 1.8: “The CSA believes that a quality education flourishes only in an intellectually free climate. We oppose, therefore, any and all attempts to impose political or other selection criteria, in short, any non-academic criteria, upon the academic and research work of post-secondary education. Academic freedom and a quality education are indivisible. We recognize that academic and research work must be undertaken with a spirit of responsibility to society, as befits its intellectual leaders.”

Highlighted Incidents

None

University of Ottawa

Campus Overview

Location: Ottawa

Undergraduate Student Union: Student Federation of the University of Ottawa (SFUO)

CFS Affiliation: CFS Local 41

Speech Policy

- University Policy
 - *Policy 28 - Use of University of Ottawa Facilities and Services*
 - 17: “The University reserves the right to determine the number of security guards required, with costs to be covered by the user.”
 - *Policy 67a - Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination*
 - § Glossary of Terms: “Harassment means engaging in a course of vexatious comment or conduct that is known or ought reasonably to be known to be unwelcome. A single unwelcome incident, if serious enough, can be sufficient to support an instance of harassment. Harassment includes comments or conduct that intimidates, humiliates, undermines or dominates the other person by belittling, embarrassing or demeaning them or involves the use of abusive or threatening language”
 - § Glossary of Terms: “Discrimination means: a) a distinction... because of a person’s race, ancestry, ethnic origin, creed, place of origin, colour, citizenship, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity and expression, age, pregnancy, marital status, family status, record of offences, political affiliation, religious belief, disability or means to accommodate the disability; and b) that has the effect of erecting barriers, or creating obligations, disadvantages or situations of unequal treatment that withhold or limit access to privileges, advantages or political, social or economic rights available to other members of society.
- SFUO Constitution
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy
- SFUO By-Laws
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy
- SFUO Policy Manual
 - *Policy 51: Pro-Choice*

- “The Student Federation of the University of Ottawa affirms a women’s right to choose. No SFUO resources, space, recognition or funding will be allocated to enhance groups/individuals who are members of or directly affiliated with external organizations with the primary or sole purpose of anti choice/pro-life activities.”

Highlighted Incidents

1. In October 2017, the SFUO began a systematic campaign to target student groups that they do not agree with politically, most notably “Students for Life” and “Hillel Ottawa” (the Jewish cultural club). In October 2017, the SFUO notified Students for Life were notified that they had been de-ratified as a club, arguing “[Students for Life]’s mandate is in contention with the SFUO’s principles.” In November, the SFUO passed a motion banning all pro-life clubs from campus and then retroactively applied this rule to justify their expulsion of Students for Life.
2. In March 2017, it was reported that four current and incoming members of the SFUO executive attended the AGM of *La Rotonde*, the French-language campus newspaper, in an effort to obtain seats on their Board of Directors. It is believed that this was done in an effort to censor *La Rotonde*, who had written many articles critical of the SFUO throughout the school year. The four executive members left the meeting when it was discovered that SFUO executives were barred from holding board seats with *La Rotonde* and were informed that the board has no influence over what the newspaper publishes. Frederique Mazerolle, editor of *La Rotonde*, told the English-language newspaper “we knew that [their] intent was to intimidate us.”
3. In March 2014, CAFE hosted a talk called “What’s Equality Got To Do With It? Men’s Issues and Feminism’s Double Standards” with guest speaker Janice Fiamengo. After she started, a group called the “Revolutionary Students Movement” began banging tables, blowing into vuvuzelas and preventing patrons from entering the hall. The University of Ottawa Protection Services pleaded with the disruptors to stop rather than removing them. The event was relocated to smaller room and the fire alarm was pulled. Allan Rock, President of the University of Ottawa, told the student newspaper “I was happy to see that [Dr. Fiamengo] had a platform to speak from...She seems to have elicited interest from those in attendance, and the university is a great place for vigorous discussion of controversial views. I’m glad there was such a discussion.”

University of Toronto

Campus Overview

Location: Toronto, Mississauga

Undergraduate Student Unions:

- Association of Part-Time Undergraduate Students of the University of Toronto
- University of Toronto Students' Union
- University of Toronto at Mississauga Students' Union

CFS Affiliations:

- CFS Local 19
- CFS Local 97
- CFS Local 109

Speech Policy

- University of Toronto Governing Council Policy
 - *Statement on Protection of Free of Speech*
 - ¶ 1: "The University community has held that the essential purpose of the University is to engage in the pursuit of truth, the advancement of learning and the dissemination of knowledge... which means the right to examine, question, investigate, speculate, and comment on any issue without reference to prescribed doctrine, as well as the right to criticize the University and society at large."
 - ¶ 2: "Often this debate may generate controversy and disputes among members of the University and of the wider community. In such cases, the University's primary obligation is to protect the free speech of all involved. The University must allow the fullest range of debate."
 - ¶ 3: "There are limits to the right of free speech, for example, when members of the University use speech as a direct attack that has the effect of prevent the lawful exercise of speech by members or invited guests, or interfering with the conduct of authorized University business...Although no member of the University should use language or indulge in behaviour intended to demean others on the basis of their race, ancestry, etc... The values of mutual respect and civility may, on occasion, be superseded by the need to protect lawful freedom of speech."
 - *Code of Student Conduct*

- B.1.(e): “No person shall engage in a course of vexatious conduct that is directed at one or more specific individuals, and that is based on the race, ancestry, place of origin, ethnic origin, citizenship, sex, sexual orientation, creed, age, marital status, handicap, receipt of public assistance or record of offences of that individual or those individuals, and that is known to be unwelcome”
- B.2.¶1: Disruption; “No person shall cause by action, threat or otherwise, a disturbance that the members knows obstructs any activity organized by the University of Toronto ... the right of another member to ... legitimate activities, [or] to speak or to associate with others.”
- B.2.¶2: “For example, peaceful picketing or other activity outside a class or meeting that does not substantially interfere with the communication inside, or impede access to the meeting, as an acceptable expression of dissent. And silent or symbolic protest is not to be considered disruption under this Code. But noise that obstructs the conduct of a meeting or forcible blocking of access to an activity constitutes disruption”
- *Policy on the Recognition of Campus Groups*
 - ¶2: “The University is guided by a commitment to the right of University members to communicate and to discuss and explore all ideas, to organize groups for any lawful purpose, to move about the University and to use its facilities in any reasonable way, to distribute on campus, in a responsible way, published material provided that it is not unlawful, to hold meetings, to debate and to engage in peaceful demonstrations, and to freedom from discrimination on the basis of sex, race or religion.”
 - ¶4: “The University will not attempt to censor, control or interfere with any group on the basis of its philosophy, beliefs, interests or opinions expressed unless and until these lead to activities which are illegal or which infringe the rights and freedoms already mentioned.”
- *Procedures for the Temporary Use of Space at the University of Toronto*
 - III.1: “The University may, as a condition of booking, require that authorized security be made available during the use of the space, including but not limited to where the building would normally be closed at the time of the event. The University may require such

security to be provided at the cost of the user and to be arranged by the University.”

- III.3: “The University at its discretion may assess additional security requirements and require that the Campus Police be present at any event. These costs are normally the responsibility of the group booking the event.”
- UTSU Constitution
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy
- UTSU Bylaws
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy
- UTSU Policies
 - *Union Clubs*
 - § Recognition Guidelines, 1: “The objectives and activities of groups seeking recognition should be seen as attempting to contribute to the educational, recreational, social or cultural values of the University of Toronto community.”
 - § Recognition Guidelines, 2: “Recognized clubs must uphold the Canadian Human Rights Code. This includes policies that uphold discrimination against race, national or ethnic origin, colour, status, creed religion, sex, sexuality, gender identity, gender expression, age, class, mental or physical ability or political orientation.”

Highlighted Incidents

1. In a letter sent to Dr. Jordan Peterson from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences on October 16th, 2016
 - “The law of Ontario, specifically the Ontario Human Rights Code, protects against discrimination based on gender expression and gender identity. Depending on the context, if personal pronouns are being used, the refusal by a teacher or colleague to use the personal pronoun that is an expression of the person’s gender identity can constitute discrimination.”
 - “Your statements that you will refuse to refer to transgendered persons using gender neutral pronouns if they ask you to do so are contrary to the rights of those persons to equal treatment without discrimination based on their “gender identity” and “gender expression”.”
2. “On September 26, 2017, an email was circulated to University of Toronto Human Resources & Equity (HR) staff by Vice President, Human Resources & Equity Angela Hildyard informing them that all HR staff must undergo “mandatory anti-discrimination and anti-bias training.”

University of Waterloo

Campus Overview

Location: Waterloo

Undergraduate Student Union: Federation of Students (FEDS)

CFS Affiliation: None

Speech Policy

- University Policy
 - *Policy 33 – Ethical Behaviour*
 - §1: General Principles: The university believes that “the right of individuals to advance their views openly must be upheld throughout the University.”
 - §1: General Principles: “The University supports academic freedom for all members of the University community...The academic environment which fosters free debate may from time to time include the presentation or discussion of unpopular opinions or controversial material. Such material shall be dealt with as openly, respectfully and sensitively as possible.”
 - §1: General Principles: The university must provide an environment free from harassment.
 - §2: Specific Principles: defines harassment “engaging in a course of vexatious comment or conduct that is known, or ought reasonably to be known, to be unwelcome.”
 - *Guidelines on use of Waterloo computing and network resources*
 - §1: General Principles: The University “strives to provide its members with an environment of free inquiry and expression. Freedom of expression and academic freedom in electronic format have the same latitude as in printed or oral communication.”
 - *Policy 2 – Bulletin Boards, Temporary Signs, and Notices*
 - 1.f: “The President or his delegate reserves the right to instruct the removal of any notice or sign considered to be objectionable.”
- FEDS By-laws (Constitution)
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy
- FEDS Students Policies
 - *Policy 14: Clubs*
 - FEDS will deal with all campus clubs in the following way: “Although the views expressed by members of our community are

diverse and sometimes diametrically opposed, [FEDS] respect the opinions of all those who respect the rights of others.”

- *Policy 21: Freedom of Speech and Expression on Campus*

- FEDS encourages the University of Waterloo Senate to adopt the “Chicago Principles” as university policy.
- FEDS will not discriminate against any club on the basis of the club’s political ideology.
- FEDS will not disinvite speakers or ban speakers from campus and will lobby the University to do the same.

[Editor's Note: the FEDS website indicates that this policy expired on October 22, 2017, thus making it no longer enforceable.]

University of Windsor

Campus Overview

Location: Windsor

Undergraduate Student Union: University of Windsor Students' Alliance (UWSA)

CFS Affiliation: CFS Local 49

Speech Policy

- University Policy
 - *Bylaw 33: Student Rights and Freedoms*
 - §2, ¶1: “[The University] accepts as first principles the rights of freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication, as interpreted under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms...In the University classroom environment, these freedoms shall mean a reasonable opportunity for a student to question and to comment upon material under discussion and to introduce material relevant to the topic under discussion.”
 - §2, ¶2: “The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms also guarantees to everyone the freedom of peaceful assembly and the freedom of association.”
 - *Policy on Student Code of Conduct*
 - §1: Principles: “[The University] is a place where freedom of expression is protected vigorously and uncompromisingly and where civility of expression in word and deed is the code of conduct.”
 - §3.B.ii: Forbays the “intentional [obstruction] or disruption of teaching, research, administration, disciplinary proceedings, or other University activities.
 - §3.B.vii: Forbays “knowingly creating a situation that endangers or threatens the health, safety or well-being of any person or that threatens to damage or destroy property, while on campus or while off-campus and representing, or acting as a representative of, the University or a student group/organization.”
 - *University of Windsor Human Rights Policy*
 - Lists four types of prohibited behaviours which are all banned by the University. The second is “written materials”, which includes the “displaying or distributing...otherwise offensive materials or graffiti.” The fourth is “non-verbal behaviour”, which includes

“avoidance, exclusion and inaction; refusing to talk or work with another member of the University community because of personal, physical, racial or ethnic characteristics; condescension, paternalism or patronising behaviour.”

- *University of Windsor Sign Posting Policy*
 - §1: “All posters/banners must adhere to the University of Windsor Language Equity Policy, particularly, ‘there shall be respect for individual worth, dignity, integrity and capacity.’”
- *University of Windsor Language Equity Guide*
 - This guide gives examples of acceptable language that students should use and examples of unacceptable language. For example, “staffing the booth” should be used instead of “manning the booth” and “mankind” should be replaced with “humankind.”
 - NB: This policy is a guideline and students cannot be punished on the basis of the guide
- UWSA Constitution
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy
- UWSA By-Laws
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy
- UWSA Board Policies
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy

Highlighted Incidents

1. On October 21, 2015, Ishmael Khaldi, an Israeli diplomat, was invited by a student group to give a talk on his experiences growing up as a member of the Bedouin minority group in Israel. The event was disrupted by members of the “Palestinian Solidarity Group”, who held up signs and shouted slogans from the audience while the event was proceeding. The University of Windsor did not send any security to stop the disruptors and the university did not condemn the disruptors.
2. In October, 2015, Life Choice, the pro-life student, staged a chalking event where they wrote pro-life messages and statistics around the campus. The day of the chalking event, Maggie McAuley, one of the organizers, had been notified via her mother that her actions were illegal and that she would be removed from class by police if her mother did not disclose her location. McAuley was notified by police after the event that she had engaged in “public mischief and trespassing” by engaging in the event. Dr. Clayton Smith, Dean of Students with the university, told McAuley that her actions constituted graffiti despite other groups had been permitted to do such things in the past.

University of Western Ontario

Campus Overview

Location: London

Undergraduate Student Union: University Student Council (USC)

CFS Affiliation: None

Speech Policy

- University Policy
 - Policy 1.38 – Rights and Responsibilities of Academic Freedom
 - Preamble: “Academic freedom provides a university community with the protection that must accompany independent research and the publication of its results...Academic freedom ensures that such ideas can be expressed without fear of interference or repression from university administrators, politicians, or others.”
 - Resolution: “The University of Western Ontario reaffirms the principle of academic freedom with its attendant rights and responsibilities.”
 - The University of Western Ontario Code of Student Conduct
 - 1.7: “Nothing in this Code shall be construed to prohibit peaceful assemblies and demonstrations, lawful picketing, or to inhibit free speech as guaranteed by law.”
 - Policy 1.35 – Non-Discrimination/Harassment Policy
 - 2.2: defines harassment as “vexatious comment or conduct that is known or ought reasonably to be known to be unwelcome.”
 - 2.7: “Harassment does not include; c) the exercise of expression protected by the [University of Western Ontario Faculty Association] Article Academic Freedom.”
 - Policy 1.5 – Picketing, Distribution of Literature and Related Activities
 - 1.00: members of the university community are allowed to picket, distribute literature (provided it is not libelous, aims to incite a riot, or “beyond the bounds of common decency”) and congregate, provided they do not interfere with the rights of others or break the law while doing so.
- USC Policy
 - University Students’ Council of the University of Western Ontario Community Standards Policy

- 3.01: “Acts of expression within community space, including within the UCC, are strictly prohibited if such acts; (1) are deemed objectionable.”

Highlighted Incidents

1. In November 2015, the University Student Council’s Vice President for Student Services confirmed that the USC would not ban a Men’s Right Associations club if they were to apply, so long as they agreed to follow the rules imposed on clubs.

Wilfrid Laurier University

Campus Overview

Location: Waterloo

Undergraduate Student Union: Wilfrid Laurier University Students' Union (WLUSU)

CFS Affiliation: None

Speech Policy

- University Policy
 - *Values, Vision, Mission*
 - § Mission: “Wilfrid Laurier University is devoted to excellence in learning, research, scholarship and creativity. It challenges people to become engaged and aware citizens of an increasingly complex world. It fulfils its mission by advancing knowledge, supporting and enhancing high-quality undergraduate, graduate and professional education, and emphasizing co-curricular development of the whole student.”
 - *4.6 Bulletin Boards and Temporary Signs and Notices*
 - 3.04: “All notices, posters, banners, and advertisements must conform to the University's Style Guide. The President or delegate reserves the right to have any notice, poster, or banner considered to be objectionable removed.”
 - *12.2 Student Code of Conduct and Discipline*
 - 1, ¶1: “The university recognizes academic freedom and the right to peaceful protest, acknowledging that the common good of society depends upon the search for knowledge, and its free expression. To this end, Wilfrid Laurier University requires that students conduct themselves in accordance with the laws of the country, province, region, and municipality as well as the policies of the university.”
 - *12.3 Non-Academic Student Code of Conduct*
 - E.1: “Disruption or obstruction by action, threat or otherwise, of any University activity including teaching, learning, research, administration, disciplinary proceedings, events, or any behaviour or conduct that disrupts the normal operations of the University and infringes on the rights of other members of the University community” is prohibited.
 - *12.4 Gendered and Sexual Violence Policy and Procedures*

- 3.02: “Gendered Violence: an act or actions that reinforce gender inequalities resulting in physical, sexual, emotional, economic or mental harm. This violence includes sexism, gender discrimination, gender harassment, biphobia, transphobia, homophobia and heterosexism, intimate partner violence, and forms of Sexual Violence. This violence can take place on any communication platform (e.g., graffiti, online environments, and through the use of phones).”
- 5.40: *(Note for Capital Current: This is a summary of the section. The term “Re-education” is not used verbatim in the policy).* The following are all different forms of punishment one could receive for violating the policy: disciplinary warning or written reprimand; denial of university privileges; behavioural contract where the offending student must contractually agree to reform their behaviour; mandatory re-education; suspension; or expulsion.
- 8.04: “Accompanying procedures outline how the University responds to incidents of Gendered and Sexual Violence involving Members of the University Community. These procedures aim to be responsive to the complexities of Gendered and Sexual Violence while recognizing the Intersectionality of all parties involved. All Members of the University Community found responsible for committing acts of Gendered/and or Sexual Violence will be held accountable and may be subject to sanctions and discipline. The University is committed to responding to Reports and Official Complaints of Gendered Violence fairly and expeditiously.”
 - *Statement on Freedom of Expression*
 - § Inclusive Freedom: Laurier challenges the idea that free expression and the goals of diversity, equity, and inclusion must be at odds with one another. Instead, the university embraces the concept of “inclusive freedom” which espouses a commitment to the robust protection of free expression, and the assurance that all members – including those who could be marginalized, silenced, or excluded from full participation – have an opportunity to meaningfully engage in free expression, enquiry, and learning.”
- WLUSU Constitution
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy
- WLUSU By-Laws
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy

- WLUSU Policy Manual
 - *Mission, Vision & Guiding Principles*
 - § Our Guiding Principles, ¶ 4: “We will strive to promote and foster a culture of inclusivity and safety within the greater Laurier community. We will remain cognizant of our unique Laurier culture and make decisions accordingly.”
 - *Clubs and Associations Department Policy*
 - § Club Approval, 5: “The Clubs and Associations Department will not ratify any club or association that practices any form of coercive techniques on their membership, nor any clubs or association that are found to be associated with an outside body which practices coercion or knowingly violates any of the procedures contained herein.”
 - § Social Media, 1.a: “All clubs and associations shall not post content that does not act in accordance with the Wilfrid Laurier University Harassment & Discrimination Policy, The Gendered and Sexual Violence Policies & Procedures, and the Student Code of Conduct.”

Highlighted Incidents

1. In November 2017, Teaching Assistant Lindsay Shepherd played an excerpt from an episode of TVO’s *The Agenda* to one of her classes as part of her teaching material. The clip drew attention because it featured University of Toronto professor Dr. Jordan Peterson as a panelists. After showing the clip, Shepherd encouraged the class to debate the use of “they” as a pronoun afterwards. A week later, Shepherd was called into a meeting by WLU’s “Diversity and Equity” office for having allegedly violated the university’s *Gendered and Sexual Violence Policy and Procedures*. This meeting included such claims as comparing Shepherd playing an excerpt of Dr. Peterson’s position to “neutrally playing a speech by Hitler”. This incident immediately made international news and has since been a source of contention regarding free speech both on WLU and on Canadian university campuses in general.

York University

Campus Overview

Location: Toronto

Undergraduate Student Union: York Federation of Students (YFS)

CFS Affiliation: CFS Local 68

Speech Policy

- University Policy
 - *University Academic Plan 2010-2015: Enhancing Academic Quality in a Globalized World*
 - § Our Values: York University believes in an “unswerving commitment to academic freedom” and “willingness to challenge but also to tolerate and respect ideas that may differ from our own.”
 - *Student Rights & Responsibilities*
 - § Student Rights and Responsibilities: gives students the right to participate in events without fear of harassment, freedom of inquiry on campus and the right to engage in dialogue with new ideas (among others). At the same time, students have the responsibility of non-interference, not act in a threatening or harmful manner, uphold civility and be respectful of the ideas of others.
 - *Temporary Use of University Space*
 - When bringing in “controversial speakers”, section 5.2 gives the university the sole authority to determine the security requirements of an event, rather than allowing the organizers to make this decision.
 - When bringing in “controversial speakers”, the organizers are responsible for damages caused during the event, including damage caused by protestors and other unwelcome attendees.
- YFS Constitution
 - This document does not contain any relevant policy
- YFS By-Laws
 - *Bylaw 5: Executive Members*

- 5.6.e.vi: the VP Equity is responsible for raising issues of “discrimination and equity” in the university community.
- YFS Policies
 - *Operations Policy #6 – Club Funding Policy*
 - 1.5: “The YFS does not support, promote, or fund activities that are discriminatory as defined by the Ontario Human Rights Code and YFS policies.”
 - *Operations Policy #16 – Club Ratification Policy*
 - 1.1: “The objectives and activities of [clubs] seeking recognition should be seen as attempting to contribute to, but not limited to, educational, recreational, social or cultural values of the York University Community.”
 - 1.6: “The YFS does not support, promote or fund activities that are discriminatory as defined by the Ontario Human Rights Code and YFS policies.”
 - 1.7: “The YFS will not ratify any groups that practice any form of coercive...techniques of their membership or potential membership, nor any student groups who are found to be associated with an outside body who practices coercion, or knowingly violates any of the procedures listed above.”

Highlighted Incidents

1. In January 2012, the YFS announced a contest to decide what would replace the existing mural in the Student Centre. The contest stipulated that the winning mural would be installed in May and replaced in 2015. The winning entry, entitled “Palestinian Roots,” featured a man with a Palestinian scarf holding a rock as a tree was being uprooted in the distance. Natalie Slavat, President of “Hillel at York” (York’s Jewish cultural club), wrote an open letter to the Student Centre Executive Director saying, “in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, stone-throwing means one thing: violence.” Mamdouh Shoukri, President of York University, responded to the letter saying, “I believe it is the right of all students, professors, and in fact all Canadians, to express their opinions and to join together to advocate for changes they believe will improve the university and society in general...Displaying the painting in question is not illegal, and as such I accept the right of the artist to share his political position using it.”